

**FLATHEAD COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
JULY 9, 2008**

- CALL TO ORDER** A meeting of the Flathead County Planning Board was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. Board members present were Marie Hickey-AuClaire, Gene Dziza, Mike Mower, Gordon Cross, Frank DeKort, Jim Heim and Marc Pitman. Rita Hall and Randy Toavs had excused absences. Dianna Broadie, Alex Hogle and BJ Grieve represented the Flathead County Planning & Zoning Office.
- There were approximately 8 people in the audience.
- APPROVAL OF MINUTES** DeKort made a motion seconded by Heim to approve the June 4, 2008 and June 11, 2008 meeting minutes.
- The motion was carried by quorum.
- PUBLIC COMMENT**
(not related to agenda items) None.
- THELINE ZONE CHANGE (FZC-08-05)** A Zone Change request in the Evergreen and Vicinity Zoning District by Clint Theline, from R-1 (Suburban Residential) and R-2 (One-Family Limited Residential) to B-2 (General Business). The properties are located at 84, 92, 102 and 104 West Reserve Drive, and contain approximately 8 acres.
- STAFF REPORT** Dianna Broadie reviewed Staff Report FZC 08-05 for the Board.
- BOARD QUESTIONS** Cross asked Broadie to walk him through the map pictured in the staff report. He wasn't able to tell what the zoning was for each property.
- Broadie pointed the properties out on the map and stated the zoning for parcels in the area.
- APPLICANT PRESENTATION** Clint Theline represented the property owners requesting the zone change. He stated he had a dual purpose for being here tonight and pointed out on the map which property was his. He said he wanted to have an antique shop on his property; therefore, the zone change is necessary as it is zoned residential. He is also the pastor of Faith Baptist Church and pointed out where the new church was built. They are not intending to change anything as far as uses. The church building acts as sort of a buffer zone. He showed some pictures to the board showing what the properties had been and what they are now. He spoke about traffic and stated he thought the zone change would clean it all up through there.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

None.

**AGENCY
COMMENTS**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENTS**

Tammi Fisher, of Fisher Law Firm, represented Richard Sauerbier, an adjoining property owner. She presented a letter to the board on Mr. Sauerbier's behalf. She said he isn't opposed to responsible growth or appropriate growth; his concern is changing the zoning for the purpose of establishing an antique shop. She spoke about the current zoning in the surrounding area and said the DePaul auto repair business would still be a non-conforming use under the zone change to B-2. It would become more in compliance, but still a non-conforming use, actually a conditional use. One area has B-1 zoning, but that would be changed, and they are adding an additional zone. Surrounding this zone change, they would not be minimizing the number of zones in the area; it would actually combine an R-1 and R-2 to a B-2. When you look at zoning this is a long-term look. This is not something we foresee a number of zone changes in the area over the course of time, we have to look at long-range planning. When the applicant said they don't really intend to do anything, despite the zone change, the board has to look at what the potential is down the road. At build-out there could be up to 64 lots within this zone change area. It is surrounded predominately by SAG-10 and residential areas. When the board looks at whether or not it affects the value of the building, they have to look at whether it affects the value of the existing buildings, not what would be proposed or what would be changed. Mr. Sauerbier's home is approximately 10 feet from the church property line; she doesn't think people move into a residential area based upon the commercial value next to it. It would impact the residential value of the buildings in the area. She doesn't believe the zone change conforms to that requirement or the criteria under statute. She basically went through all of her letters and all of the different portions of the growth policy they didn't think this zone change complied with. She talked about the existing community character and commercial land development, the arterial road, and said the existing uses are mostly residential and there are some home-based businesses. This zone change request wouldn't change those home-based businesses as they are allowed under the current zoning. They are concerned about traffic flow. Many more lots could be created with this zone change, which would increase the traffic substantially. She couldn't say whether or not the arterial road could handle that amount of traffic, but said it would impact the residential nature of the area. She said if the purpose of the zone change is to establish an antique shop, this could be done through a variance. Why include the other lots if there is not a proposed change to the use of the properties. Why change the zoning if they are not looking at future commercial development. That would be a pretty drastic measure. The zone change does not comply with the Flathead County maps or the Kalispell maps, although they could

certainly pick different portions of the growth policy it does comply with. It is a living document and they could find equal portions where it doesn't comply with the growth policy. Mr. Sauerbier was in favor of the church; he thought that would be appropriate for the residential character of the neighborhood. However, adding more business development in the area would decrease the value of his land as well as the surrounding land. He is not prepared to let it all go business especially if the DePaul auto repair shop will not become a use allowed under B-2 zoning and will still be non-conforming or a conditional use. The whole purpose of this zone change is to open up an antique shop however the potential build-out is of great concern to him.

Hickey-AuClaire asked Ms. Fisher to point out Mr. Sauebier's property on the map.

Pitman asked what the potential build-out for R-1 zoning would be. Could they build condominiums there? What is the density?

Broadie said one unit per acre. There are eight acres all together and it does have public utilities. R-2 zoning would be half-acre lots and a small portion of the area is R-2. They might get nine or ten units all together if it were to remain as it is.

Pitman asked how much of the area to be re-zoned is surrounded by residential.

Fisher pointed out the residential areas on the map and said when she drove through the area it appeared to her there was some open space, open land as well as agricultural and residential housing. She believed it was surrounded on two sides by residential, one side is SAG-10 and over half is surrounded by industrial business for Plum Creek which has its own zoning.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

Mr. Theline stated as far as he knows Mr. Sauerbier is not a registered landowner in the area. He does not own property but he resides there.

Richard Sauerbier stated his mother owns the property that he is involved with. A lot surrounded on two sides by Faith Baptist Church property. He was there to represent his mother; she is 90 years old and he rents from her and is in the process of buying it. He stated he is not a landowner in that neighborhood but he felt he had rights as any other landowner.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

Broadie wanted to point out the auto repair shop would still be an allowed use and it would be conforming. The only thing it wouldn't have would be conditions as to how it would operate. We wouldn't have to go through a conditional use permit for them to operate. She pointed out the different zones in the area and stated that although it is residential zoning there are a number of non-conforming business uses still operating on-site. Even though it is zoned residential they

are non-conforming uses. What happens is you have a heavy duty industrial site, you have an already zoned business site and you have a number of residences that are actually operating as businesses. She thought the majority was really surrounded by more commercial or industrial uses so she would argue the character of the neighborhood as opposed to what Ms. Fisher did. She also pointed out there is an excellent line of site, she took pictures from the place and was able to walk along a sidewalk at least on one side. It has a full stop light at the intersection to control traffic. She thought the public safety was fine with respect to the road.

Heim asked what the difference between density and intensity would be based on the sentence in the staff report.

Broadie said density is basically how many units per acre would be allowed and intensity is what the allowed uses would be for the property. Density is controlled by the minimum size of one acre and the intensity is controlled by the uses that are allowed.

Pitman wanted Broadie to clarify the potential build-out for B-2 zoning. He thought it to be one lot per acre.

Cross said the requested change would be to B-2 zoning and the minimum lot area would be 7500 square feet.

Broadie said they could get six lots in there but each of those lots would have to provide parking because typically that's what happens for commercial uses. Usually parking controls the size of the building.

Grieve said rule-of-thumb on that is to take the density that works out by the math and take about 30 percent of that out for infrastructure which is roads and parking and things you are not going to be able to use.

Broadie said most things in this area develop at one or maybe two stories.

**MOTION TO
ADOPT F.O.F**

Pitman made a motion seconded by Hickey-AuClaire to adopt Staff Report FZC-08-05 as findings-of-fact.

**MOTION TO
REMOVE
SENTENCE**

Pitman requested the board remove the sentence on page four of the staff report regarding the Density/Intensity. The density in R-1 zones is controlled by minimum lot size of 1 acre. ~~The intensity of the R-1 zone is controlled by minimum lot size of 20,000 sq. ft.~~ The intensity of the zone is controlled by the allowed uses.

The motion carried by quorum.

**ROLL CALL TO
ADOPT F.O.F**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION TO
APPROVE**

Hickey-AuClaire made a motion seconded by Pitman to adopt Staff Report FZC-08-05 and recommended approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Heim wanted to know when the area was zoned.

Grieve said Evergreen and vicinity was zoned in 1993.

Heim pointed out that Plum Creek has had sawmills around that area for at least 50-60 years, pre-dating the subdivision in the area. It seemed like a natural area for this to become more dense and more commercial and he would support the recommendation.

Hickey-AuClaire agreed and said things are improving in the area and there are definitely a lot of home-based businesses in that corridor as well. It's a natural progression that should be there as the future grows there.

Cross agreed but had a problem with the B-2 zoning although he didn't think they had a choice given the current categories in the zoning regulations. They clearly have a line where there is a subdivision that is not going to go commercial. It seemed as though something other than B-2, which could potentially put 64 commercial lots right up next to it, there could be a transition commercial zone that would make it less intense but there isn't such a zone. The board can't fault the applicant for not selecting something that wasn't an option. He understood the comments from Ms. Fisher and her client, it's tough when you see that area in transition but tend to think given that location the handwriting is on the wall.

Mower said he is never very much in favor of little pieces of zoning like this. Although, when he thought about this application, it's fairly clear the direction it's going. He thought the size of the lots would be something that they could make a commercial subdivision out of but it won't be 7500 square foot lots it would be something much bigger that they could put professional offices on. He thought the sizes would be self limiting and they have enough space and a single entrance onto west Reserve.

**ROLL CALL TO
APPROVE**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**DELL
SUBDIVISION
(FPP-08-11)**

A request by Dale and Irene McMurren for Preliminary Plat approval of Dell Subdivision, a two lot single-family residential subdivision on 32.8 acres. Lots in the subdivision are proposed to have public water and sewer systems. The property is located at 275 Coverdell Road.

STAFF REPORT

Alex Hogle reviewed Staff Report FPP-08-11 for the Board.

**BOARD
QUESTIONS**

Pitman asked how far the applicant would have to extend the road.

Hogle pointed it out on the map and stated the road is already laid out with a 60 foot easement. There has only been one user on it so it is basically a two tract 12-foot wide actual used surface. It is very well prepped for a full 24-foot road it just hasn't been utilized in that manner. Once this subdivision has been developed the standard threshold of ten ingress/egress trips per day per residence, added on with the existing roadway, and the southern portion as well as the intersection would certainly see more usage. Whether it's adequate now or not it is a recommended condition of approval that the road be insured to meet the minimum design standards outlined in the regulations. Hogle referenced the Road Design Standards the county has adopted.

Heim asked how far from the property the water line was.

Hogle said approximately 1000 feet to the corner of the property and then another 280 feet to the other end.

Heim said the theory behind requiring people to extend to the edge of the property is that the property cannot block the next extension. When you are on a county road that property cannot block the next extension and this property doesn't need it. So that argument should be more with the Bigfork Water & Sewer District rather than a condition.

Hogle said Julie Spence, of the Bigfork Water & Sewer District, had stated the intent was to minimize difficulties with paved surfaces of roads and other improvements. He understood what Heim was saying because it would be within the county road utility easement.

Pitman said Coverdell Road is already paved so the difficulty is there whether you do it now or later.

Hogle said it is not paved the full width of the easement and the water and utilities aren't under the pavement they are actually on the north side of the pavement in the easement. He interpreted the comment by the Bigfork Water & Sewer District to mean if you had improvements it was just a matter of less obstacles to deal with.

Pitman said the applicant proposed this with one ten acre lot and for simplicity it was probably easier to have the driveway come off the county road.

Hogle said he is proposing a ten acre lot split from 32 acres and there are some other elements to the annexation history of this parcel that

are interesting. There was a time when the whole parcel, at one point, was annexed. Then they went through a process to pull back a portion and left the ten acre portion on the west annexed but not the rest. He wasn't sure of the reason behind all of that but the applicant would be able to answer those questions.

Heim asked where the sewer line stopped.

Hogle stated it's already in place and staff is not asking the applicant to extend the sewer line. The applicant is requesting an alternative to provide water from a well. This was not something staff had a chance to review so he wanted to leave that for discussion with the applicant.

Mower asked how far the water line was to the west.

Hogle said basically they would be looking at a 1200 foot extension which would include three hydrants as well.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION

Olaf Ervin, Montana Mapping Associates, represented the applicants. He stated they didn't have any problems with the conditions except #13. The reason why there had been this change is that they had received more specifics from the Bigfork Water & Sewer District and what they were going to require. It's a 12-inch main and they are going to require it to be extended as a 12-inch main, completely at Mr. McMurrens' cost, to the far side of the district. He stated they always deal with a three to one ratio when they are dealing with DEQ approval. If it costs more than three times to extend water or sewer services than to put in a septic or a well then you are a candidate for a waiver. This is almost 100 times the cost and is not what the applicant was expecting. The reason the sewer main was built there was because Mr. McMurren paid \$100,000 dollars to the Bigfork Water & Sewer District to extend that past the Catholic Church to his property. He paid \$5,000 a year for 20 years. They agree with the staff report and have no problem with paving the entrance on the unnamed road consistent with the county standards. He spoke of paving being fair and consistent and having no problem with that condition. He said it was possible the driveway would be closer to Coverdell Road and built to county gravel road standards. What they would like to see the planning board do is to leave the shared well or public water system question in the hands of DEQ. He spoke of a DEQ waiver and whether or not it would be economically impractical to have the applicant extend the 12-in water main. In this case they have an existing well that is outside the district that is capable of being shared between two lots. The cost of turning that into a shared well would be approximately \$1500 vs. probably about \$70,000+ to extend the 12-inch main with all the hydrants. They thought it would be best left to DEQ. If they deem that a waiver is appropriate they would like that opportunity. They were concerned because Bigfork Water & Sewer District had passed a resolution to prohibit cross connections and limit the use of private wells within the district. They were concerned that

BOARD QUESTIONS

what was being proposed here would not be compliant with that. But as you read through it, the use of an existing well that's outside of the district, not punching in another well, would be within the scope of what is allowable. They are fairly confident on that issue. The most important item is they not drill a new well and protecting the aquifer from contamination. In this case it's just another connection to an existing well.

Heim asked if the applicant was asking for something different than what staff recommended.

Ervin said they were proposing new language for condition #13. He stated they did not provide staff with this because they were not aware of the costs involved at that point. It was only after the BLUAC meeting they became aware of it. They were thinking they would just have to do a little water main extension to the service line to the lot but since that's not the case it's not reasonable.

Cross stated there were some cost data in the application that indicated the \$59,000 cost for extending the water line. He wanted to know how the applicant could not be aware of it when it was included in the application.

Ervin said his company doesn't compile that portion of the application and the additional cost of running a 12-inch main takes it over the top, beyond what the applicant is able to do. We have a system in place under the DEQ administrative rules that provides for this sort of thing and they would like the opportunity to use that. DEQ doesn't have to give them a waiver but they are able to apply for one. If DEQ says no, in this case, a shared well and public sewer is appropriate we think the applicant should be able to do that.

Cross said part of the question was that Bigfork Water & Sewer is obviously looking into the future and potential future subdivision and it was his understanding the entire 32 acres is zoned SAG-5.

Hogle said the whole parcel is zoned SAG-5.

Cross said there is a potential for additional lots and if in fact that's going to happen then it makes sense to have the 12-inch water line and the sewer plus if it's going to be future subdivided, instead of a gravity feed they want a different type. Someone is looking to the future and he didn't know whether Ervin and the applicants had any discussion about future subdivision. Would they accept a no further subdivision on the face of the plat? If they are going to subdivide now is the time to put the water.

Ervin stated the applicant has expressed vehemently he has no intention of doing anything other than this.

Mower said they are exercising overkill there. If in fact they are going to decide at some later date to make an additional subdivision, the board would get another shot at it. At that point if they are going to make another 6 lots or something like that, the board would then, at that point, say it's time to extend the water.

Ervin pointed out the applicants' home and said Mr. McMurren intends to remain there.

Mower said even if he didn't and they were to do a subdivision, they would have to come before the board again.

Heim asked if they knew the Bigfork District's policy on developer agreements.

Ervin said he actually did inquire about that and Julie Spence commented they had such a bad experience with the Eagle Bend agreement that they don't do them anymore.

Pitman asked if they could do a late comers agreement.

Ervin said part of the problem is they are trying to explore all sorts of options; but for one lot, a 12-inch main without a latecomer's agreement is cost prohibitive and bordering on ridiculous.

Heim stated it just seemed strange that the parcel is in the district. If the whole parcel was in the district and now only part of it is in the district and being there causes them to spend all this money on improvement of a well, they could have had a septic system and wells on a ten acre parcel.

Ervin said he is not aware of the reasoning behind all of this as it had transpired before he had anything to do with it. They are just working with what they have right now.

Heim stated it seemed to him the issue is between the developer/sub divider and the Bigfork Water & Sewer District, not the DEQ. The subdivision regulations say that if you live within 500 feet you have to hook up to public water and sewer services. This parcel is more than 500 feet from water. He felt it should be the district ordinance that ruled, it's the subdivision rules that have the 500 foot rule.

Pitman said they had run into that circumstance before and spoke of the waiver because it was far cheaper to drill a well.

Heim asked why it was a condition of the county when the argument is with the Bigfork Water & Sewer District.

Ervin said if the board saw fit to remove condition #13 it would not hurt his feelings at all. What they proposed was something that was an alternative to that condition because they don't want it to be

completely tied up.

Grieve told the board to not misunderstand what happened here. The applicants came to us with a subdivision saying they were going to be on public water and sewer. It's not as if staff is saying they have to do wells and septic systems. Staff reviewed it as it was brought to them. Information that has come out recently is different and it's appropriate to discuss this and modify it as needed here.

Dziza stated he understood how it all happened and asked since it was municipal water system and now they are considering going to a private/shared system, is that ok for the board to do or is it too drastic for them to consider.

Hogle stated he believed it was a significant departure from what was proposed and what he reviewed. However, if this had just come in with a proposal for a well and septic staff wouldn't blink an eye on this. Frankly, what's important is the adequate mechanisms of approval get addressed through the process. He believed that the stance that staff would have would be that as long as they can meet DEQ approval before final plat, staff would not have an issue. If this had come in as a proposal for individual wells and septic, staff would have included a condition requiring that they meet the waiver if they happen to be within 500 feet of the district boundaries. That is fairly typical. One of the other things that was interesting was that staff was also guided, through the districts, to also include with that a will not serve letter from the district. He doesn't know if the DEQ requires a will not serve letter or not in the case of a waiver. He didn't believe that Bigfork Water & Sewer District would be amenable to such a letter.

Cross asked if BLUAC saw this change and was Bigfork Sewer District was aware of this proposal.

Ervin said he had been in contact with Julie Spence, the District Manager, and she was aware of it. The way the revision to condition #13 is put together there is input from the sewer and water district regardless of what the applicant wants. It may be that DEQ says they have to extend the water main and that's provided for in the revision. Then again they might say it meets all the criteria and grant a waiver. He felt this was a lot better way to do it as it allows the regulatory mechanisms to work.

Hogle addressed the applicants' proposal for an alternate condition #13 stating he would acknowledge that it does not undermine the existing recommended condition #13. The intent in the language is still included and basically creates an either/or situation. It does create an option. If that option turned out to be a viable option through further review of the sanitation requirements through the DEQ, he thought it would be adequate. Ultimately, if towards the east there are more intensive future subdivision requests that would utilize public water

and sewer, they would still have the ability to extend the line at their cost. He pointed out on page two of the staff report that there is still quite a lot of acreage zoned SAG-5 to the east of the subject property.

**AGENCY
COMMENT**

None.

**PUBLIC
COMMENT**

None.

**APPLICANT
REBUTTAL**

None.

**STAFF
REBUTTAL**

None.

**MOTION TO
ADOPT F.O.F.**

Pitman made a motion seconded by Dziza to adopt staff report FPP-08-11 as findings-of-fact.

**ROLL CALL
TO ADOPT F.O.F.**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**MOTION TO
APPROVE**

Pitman made a motion seconded by Hickey-Au Claire to adopt Staff Report FPP-08-11 and recommended approval as conditioned.

**SUBSIDIARY
MOTION
(Amend
Condition #13)**

Heim made a motion seconded by Dziza to amend condition #13 to adopt the language submitted by the applicant. The condition would read: *Lot 2 shall either share the existing well with Lot 1 or connect to the Bigfork Water and Sewer District water system. If Lot 2 is required by Montana DEQ to connect to the Bigfork Water and Sewer District water system the applicant shall extend the existing water main from its current point of termination along Coverdell Road to the eastern boundary of Lot 2 prior to final plat approval. Proof of complete installation or of DEQ waiver shall be provided at the time of final plat application in the form of a letter from the applicable water and sewer district or an original E.Q. approval letter. [Section 4.7.22(c), FCSR]*

**ROLL CALL
(Amend
Condition #13)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**SUBSIDIARY
MOTION
(Amend
Condition #14)**

Pitman made a motion seconded by Dziza to amend condition #14 to read: The applicant shall provide an engineer's certificate that an extension, *if required*, of the public water main has been installed in compliance with established state and water and sewer district standards for public water supply prior to final plat.

**ROLL CALL
(Amend
Condition #14)**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

**BOARD
DISCUSSION**

Mower asked who would be party to the road user's agreement.

Hogle said currently there is not truly a road user's agreement. But if it were then the lot to the north and the current owner.

Mower asked what if the guy to the north doesn't want to be a part of it.

Hogle said that is a challenge sometimes.

Ervin stated normally he would love to argue about this but they have actually made contact with the neighbor to the north and it doesn't appear that it will be a problem. But as a matter of policy that is the first thing that they always think of. We don't like to see a condition that they would be at the mercy of a neighbor. He reiterated that it doesn't appear it would be any problem in this case. That's the reason they are not requesting any changes.

Cross asked if the property to the west had any access off that road.

Ervin said no.

Hogle said in order to further clarify that discussion point he wanted to point out that page 4-47 of the current Flathead County Subdivision Regulations, under section 4.7.16 Access, says for a re-subdivision of an existing lot within a subdivision the road user's agreement shall be amended to include the proposed re-subdivided lots.

Pitman asked if there were a road user's agreement in effect now.

Hogle said there is not. There is currently an agreement for road maintenance that, as he discussed in the staff report, is unclear as to whether that agreement was ever perfected. It discussed the need to perfect itself within the language of the agreement and it doesn't appear that it ever happened. That is kind of the reason why the new regulations say: the commission accepts no responsibility for development of maintenance of roads and that to insure proper maintenance mechanism is in place an approved road user's agreement and property owners association shall be formed. In the past these mechanisms were covered through covenants and they are no longer allowed to be covered through covenants because there is no follow through on them. It's now part of the process.

Grieve said in other words the county doesn't care as much if your house is pink but the county cares if the road is dusty and nobody is maintaining it. So we don't care about the homeowners association but we still care about the road user's agreements so we tried to separate the two and pull them out so the two don't get confused.

Hogle said these new agreements now get filed and recorded with the Clerk and Records Office as a free standing document.

Mower said if the applicants are willing to accept that it's fine with him. He could just see it being an issue there but if they are willing to accept that it's okay.

Ervin said what they have done before in a situation like this is they propose a condition that they would institute or amend the road user's agreement and that way if the party to the north doesn't want to participate they have two parties, which you need to have in order to have an agreement, then they are responsible for maintaining the road. This is a little unique because it's one lot.

Grieve said it makes sense because normally the circumstances would be that you might have a ten lot subdivision with a road user's agreement to maintain the cul-de-sac road serving the ten lots. Now somebody comes in and re-subdivides one of those lots. That's not fair to the other nine owners that bought into that road user's agreement if you don't require the people who are re-subdividing, to go to them and say, we need to amend this agreement so as to now represent the current situation. This one is a unique circumstance and no regulations are perfect. We do the best we can with what we have and in this circumstance we have to get this road dealt with for public health and safety.

Pitman said for the future it's a good thing to have in place because then you could amend this and then the next people that come along and want to subdivide would have to do that.

Hogle said it's fairly logical to foresee that the future owner of lot two, having a ten acre parcel in SAG-5, will say it makes sense to split the lot.

Pitman said it would also be interesting to see what DEQ requires them to have for a drainage maintenance plan with this proposal.

**ROLL CALL
TO APPROVE**

On a roll call vote the motion passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Cross handed out a proposal regarding the list of things the planning office had discussed with the board a few weeks ago and wanted to get the other board members input. He had divided the list into two sections he thought the board could have subcommittees oversee and try to get things moving forward. It was his understanding that a lot of items on the list were either directly or indirectly related to implementing the growth policy. He thought by doing this they could help staff kind of move things forward.

Grieve said he had a lot of thoughts and if this was the direction the board wanted to go we could do our best to shuffle workloads around to try to accommodate some of this stuff. If this is the way the board wanted to go, just to let them know, staff would probably lean on the board pretty hard to do this stuff because we don't have anybody else to do this. We can do our best but we are getting pummeled right now with so many different things. Everyone seems to want our office to take care of something their office can't take care of. We will do our best though. Our biggest constraint of why we haven't implemented the growth policy is political will for a lot of things.

The board and staff discussed allocating resources to come up with a plan to get some of the things on the list accomplished. There was also discussion regarding the administration of the subcommittees as far as advertising, attending meetings, taking minutes and appointing citizen members to attend committee meetings.

The board discussed the agenda for the July 30, 2008 workshop regarding the revisions to the subdivision regulations. They prioritized the list and finalized it so the planning office could post it on the website.

Grieve gave some background on the text amendment regarding the interlocal agreement with Whitefish. The board and staff discussed what their role would be and what it could possibly mean to get that area back under the county jurisdiction.

NEW BUSINESS

Grieve told the board about the MAP conference at the Flathead Lake Lodge on September 22, 23, and 24th. He spoke with Harris and it was decided that the planning office would pay for registration for those board members that wished to attend.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m. on a motion by Heim. The next meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m. on July 16, 2008.

Gordon Cross, President

Mary Sevier, Recording Secretary

APPROVED AS SUBMITTED/CORRECTED: 8/13/08